

**Bumble Bee Information Kiosk Board
DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-2011-004-CX**

A. Background

BLM Office: *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: **N/A**

Proposed Action Title/Type: **Bumble Bee Information Kiosk Board**

Location of Proposed Action: **150ft west of Bumble Bee Rd(CR59) in Yavapai county**

Description of Proposed Action: **T9 1/2N, R2E Sec 33, SW1/4, NW1/4**

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: **Bradshaw-Harquahala RMP**

Date Approved/Amended: **4/22/2010**

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

☒ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

RR-51 Locate and develop parking, staging areas and trailheads as suitable for the following purposes: Facilitating responsible use, ensuring resource protection, parking and unloading of OHVs and horses.

Also see Standard Operation Procedures on pages:

A-26 Encourage “Tread Lightly!” and “Leave No Trace” travel and camping techniques

A-27 Post applicable toll-free phone numbers on **kiosks**, maps, brochures, permits...

A-35 Evaluate and plan, as needed, the installation of improvements for camping areas, off-highway vehicle use areas, toilets, scenic turnouts, interpretive sites, **kiosks**,....

Explain specific or implied decision(s)

C: Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5:

11.9 -G(4) Transportation - Placement of recreational, special designation, or information signs, visitor registers, **kiosks** and portable sanitation devices.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

I considered: **Placement of the kiosk board too close to the county road could cause traffic flow problems, complaints by residents/visitors opposed to recreation developments, mining and grazing authorization conflicts and visual resource impacts.**

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____Steven Cohn /s/_____ Date: __12/13/10_____
Steven Cohn
Field Manager, Hassayampa Field Office

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:
Thomas Bickauskas, Travel Management Coordinator 623-580-5502

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX. See Attachment 2.

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹

Attachment 1

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would: | | |
| 1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>The location of the information kiosk would be a safe distance from the county road to avoid traffic accidents from stopped vehicles, while providing the positive benefits intended to visitors of improving knowledge of rules, ethics and navigation aid.</i> |
| 2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>None of the above resources are present at this location and would not be directly or indirectly affected.</i> |
| 3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>The installation and presence of this information kiosk is in a previously disturbed area, has been surveyed for cultural and wildlife resources and no known controversy is evident. Mining claim search has found no claims. There are no grazing improvements or wildlife waters within 1/4 mile.</i> |
| 4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>The kiosk board is of small size and involves digging two holes. The area has been surveyed by HFO archeologist and nothing was found.</i> |
| 5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>Installing an information board at this existing and popular parking location should not represent any major management decisions regarding access or management since it will educate about legal activities and not in itself be permanent.</i> |
| 6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>Providing information on this board would not be a</i> |

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <i>connected action since it is intended to be short term. Long term planning for the area will further analyze the future location of information boards in the area.</i> |
| 7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>No cultural resources are present</i> |
| 8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>The site is more than 1/2mile from Black Canyon Creek, a riparian corridor where any T&E species would be located.</i> |
| 9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>No violation of known laws would occur.</i> |
| 10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>None present.</i> |
| 11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>Does not exist at this location.</i> |
| 12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: <i>The location of the kiosk is at a popular access point to public land and will include weed information.</i> |

Approval and Decision

Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Insert Program or Employee

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Insert Program or Employee

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: _____ Thomas Bickauskas _____/s/_____ **Date:** ____12/13/10_____
Project Lead

Reviewed by: _____ Leah Baker /s/_____ **Date:** ____12/13/10_____
Leah Baker
Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by: _____ Steven Cohn /s/_____ **Date:** ____12/13/10_____
Steven Cohn
Manager

Project Description:

Bumble Bee Information Kiosk Board

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By: _____ Steven Cohn /s/_____ **Date:** ____12/13/10_____
Insert Name of Manager